

United States Patent and Trademark Office

M

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,822		02/20/2002	Tomitaka Yamashita	SIMTEK6260	7485
25776	7590	05/06/2004		EXAMINER	
		LER, ATTORNEY	CHARIOUI,	CHARIOUI, MOHAMED	
	ARSEILLE ΓΒΕΑCΗ,	CA 92660	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,			2857	

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1	. /
	V

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/683,822	YAMASHITA, TOMITAKA
Examiner	Art Unit
Mohamed Charioui	2857

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 03 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]
 a)
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.NOTE:
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.⊠ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See continuation</u> .
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected:
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
8.⊠ The drawing correction filed on <u>03 April 2004</u> is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)
10.□ Other: Maux Hoff
MARC S. HOFF ^V SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

It is noted in the claim "said memory circuit being capable of being programmed by a personal computer external to said signal inspection device and detachably connectable thereto for programming said memory circuit to suit the electronic device to be tested". This limitation does not specify that the PC cannot be used during the testing. Therefore, the Applicant arguments are considered to be not persuasive.